

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this Patent Application, particularly in view of the above Amendment and the following remarks. No additional fee is required for this Amendment as the number of independent claims has not changed, and the total number of claims has not changed.

Request for Telephone Interview

Applicants kindly request the Examiner to contact the undersigned to schedule a telephone interview, to discuss the merits of this Patent Application.

Amendment to the Claims

Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 5 to further clarify the claimed invention. Support for this Amendment can be found at page 3, second full paragraph, and page 7, last paragraph, of Applicants' Substitute Specification, as well as in FIGS. 1-5.

Applicants have amended Claim 6 to correct a typographical error identified by the Examiner. Support for this Amendment can be found at page 8, second full paragraph, of Applicants' Substitute Specification.

No new matter has been added to the claims by this Amendment.

Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner objected to FIG. 1 as not including a legend reciting “Prior Art.” The above Amendment adds the words “Prior Art” to FIG. 1. Should the Examiner require any additional amendment, Applicants request the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended Claim 6 to add the limitation “including one” to correct the typographical error identified by the Examiner. Applicants urge that the above Amendment overcomes the rejection of Claim 6.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over De Jule, U.S. Patent 4,227,114.

Applicants’ claimed invention is a large-area radiator. The large-area radiator is a lamp of homogeneous luminance. The large-area radiator includes a front pane and a rear element. Spacer elements extending from the front pane to the rear element keep the front pane and the rear element separated from each other, thereby

forming a space between the front pane and the rear element wherein a gaseous filler is introduced.—The front pane is made of a glass material and at least one of the front pane and the rear element is at least a partially thermally tempered or chemically tempered glass pane.

The De Jule Patent discloses a cathodoluminescent gas discharge television display panel, not a large-area radiator of homogeneous luminance. As shown in FIG. 6, the display panel includes multiple cathodes 102 separated from anodes 106 by a barrier 104 (Column 12, lines 39-68). A spacer 110 is disposed parallel to the faceplate 100 and the backwall 92 and between the anodes 104 and certain red, green and blue illuminating display elements 124 (Column 13, lines 48-66). The barrier 104 and the spacer 110 include constrictions 105 and 105A, respectively, through which a concentrated electron beam travels from the cathode 102 through the anode 106 to the red, green and blue illuminating display elements 124. Support members 114 create a plasma-free acceleration section 115 between the spacer 110 and the transparent face plate 100 (Column 14, lines 5-16). The support members 114 do not extend from the faceplate 100 to the backwall 98.

The De Jule Patent discloses a cathodoluminescent gas discharge television screen and does not teach or suggest a large-area radiator including spacer elements extending from the front pane to the rear element to keep the front pane

apart from the rear element, and at least one of the front pane and the rear element being at least a partially thermally tempered or chemically tempered glass pane. Therefore, as the De Jule Patent does not teach each and every limitation of Applicants' amended Claim 1, the De Jule Patent does not anticipate Applicants' amended Claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Jule, U.S. Patent 4,227,114, in view of Aratani et al., U.S. Patent 4,671,814. Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Jule, U.S. Patent 4,227,114, in view of Aratani et al., U.S. Patent 4,671,814, and further in view of Suzuki et al., U.S. Patent 5,296,294, and further in view of Kent et al., International Publication WO 98/52184. Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Jule, U.S. Patent 4,227,114, in view of Duke et al., U.S. Patent 3,573,072. Claims 2-4 depend from amended Claim 1, and are patentable for at least the same reasons as amended Claim 1, discussed above.

Claims 5-8, 12 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ochiai et al., European Patent Application Publication EP 0 851 452, in view of De Jule, U.S. Patent 4,227,114.

Regarding independent Claim 5, the Ochiai et al. Publication discloses a plasma display front panel including a laminate of a transparent thermoplastic resin film and a synthetic fiber mesh plated with a metal to provide electromagnetic shielding (Page 5, lines 17-33). The laminate is needed to shield the particular electromagnetic waves emitted from a plasma television, which can effect peripheral devices and human health (Page 2, lines 8-10).

The De Jule Patent discloses a cathodoluminescent gas discharge television screen and not a plasma display, as in the Ochiai et al. Publication. The Examiner alleges it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the plasma display of the Ochiai et al. Publication with the “elements” of the De Jule Patent, as it is well known in the art for plasma displays to have the claimed elements. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner that one skilled in the art would have found a motivation or suggestion to combine the elements of the particular cathodoluminescent television screen of the De Jule Patent with the plasma display of the Ochiai et al. Publication. The television displays of the two references are of different display technologies which include different components. The Examiner has

not explained how the elements of the De Jule Patent can be incorporated into the plasma display of the Ochiai et al. Publication. In addition, neither of the television displays of these references are large-area radiators of homogeneous luminance, as in Applicants' claimed invention.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully assert that the large-area radiator of amended Claim 5, including spacer elements extending from the front pane to the rear element to keep the front pane apart from the rear element and at least one of the front pane and rear element being a glass pane at least partially coated with a ductile polymer material, would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art in view of the Ochiai et al. Publication and the De Jule Patent, either alone or in combination. Claims 6-8, 12 and 14 depend from amended Claim 5 and are patentable for at least these same reasons as Claim 5.

Claims 9, 10 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ochiai et al., European Patent Application Publication EP 0 851 452, in view of De Jule, U.S. Patent 4,227,114, and further in view of Schmitt et al., U.S. Patent 4,971,887. Claims 9, 10 and 13 depend from amended Claim 5 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as amended Claim 5, discussed above.

Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ochiai et al., European Patent Application Publication EP 0 851

Serial No.: 09/889,099

452, in view of De Jule, U.S. Patent 4,227,114, and further in view of Schmitt et al., U.S. Patent 4,971,887, and further in view of Hashimoto et al., Japanese Patent Application Publication 2000-357463. Claim 11 ultimately depends from amended Claim 5 and is patentable for at least the same reasons as amended Claim 5, discussed above.

Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ochiai et al., European Patent Application Publication EP 0 851 452, in view of De Jule, U.S. Patent 4,227,114, and further in view of Hashimoto et al., Japanese Patent Application Publication 2000-357463. Claim 15 depends from amended Claim 1 and is patentable for at least the same reasons as amended Claim 1, discussed above.

Claim 16 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Jule, U.S. Patent 4,227,114, in view of Suzuki et al., U.S. Patent 5,296,294, and further in view of Kent et al., International Publication WO 98/52184. Claim 16 depends from amended Claim 1 and is patentable for at least the same reasons as amended Claim 1, discussed above.

Conclusion

Applicants intend to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action. If the Examiner detects any issue which the Examiner believes Applicants have not addressed in this response, Applicants' undersigned attorney requests a telephone interview with the Examiner.

Applicants sincerely believe that this Patent Application is now in condition for allowance and, thus, respectfully request early allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark D. Swanson
Regis. No. 48,498

Pauley Petersen & Erickson
2800 West Higgins Road
Suite 365
Hoffman Estates, Illinois 60195
(847) 490-1400
FAX (847) 490-1403